

**SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**Mobridge School District
Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process Report 2001-2002**

Team Members : Sandy Grey Eagle, Victoria Bantam and Rita Pettigrew, Education Specialists

Dates of On Site Visit: January 7 - 9, 2002

Date of Report: May 8, 2002

This report contains the results of the steering committee's self-assessment and the validation of the self-assessment by the Office of Special Education. The report addresses six principles – General Supervision, Free Appropriate Public Education, Appropriate Evaluation, Procedural Safeguards, Individualized Education Program and Least Restrictive Environment. Each principle is rated based on the following scale:

Promising Practice	The district/agency exceeds this requirement through the implementation of innovative, high-quality programming and instructional practices.
Maintenance	The district/agency consistently meets this requirement.
Needs Improvement	The district/agency has met this requirement but has identified areas of weakness that left unaddressed may result in non-compliance.
Out of Compliance	The district/agency consistently does not meet this requirement.
Not applicable	In a small number of cases, the standard may not be applicable for your district/agency. If an item is not applicable, the steering committee should briefly explain why the item is NA. Example – no private schools within the district boundaries.

Principle 1 – General Supervision
--

General supervision means the school district's administrative responsibilities to ensure federal and state regulations are implemented and a free appropriate public education is provided for each eligible child with a disability. The specific areas addressed in principle one are child find, referral procedures, children voluntarily enrolled by parents in private schools, students placed by the school district, improving results through performance goals and indicators (assessment, drop out, graduation), professional development, suspension and expulsion rates.

Steering Committee Self-Assessment Summary

Data sources used:

- ? Child count documentation
- ? Comprehensive Plan
- ? Student Handbook
- ? Surveys
- ? Inservice Training Information
- ? CSPD Information
- ? File Reviews
- ? District/Agency Instructional Staff Information

- ? Suspension and Expulsion Information
- ? Statewide Assessment Information
- ? Enrollment Information
- ? Placement Alternatives
- ? Disabling Conditions
- ? Exiting Information
- ? Staff Interviews
- ? Suspension/Expulsion Reports

Promising Practice

The steering committee concluded the district procedure of advertising preschool screening on Channel 50 of the local television station provides an innovative means to make the public aware of this child find activity.

The steering committee identified the district's practice of ensuring parental expenses are provided for attendance at IEP meetings, trainings and counseling when students are placed out of district as a promising practice. They further concluded that paying for the services of a 20-year-old student in residential placement, abandoned by his parents, was a promising practice.

The committee identified the use of Quality School Portfolio (QSP) to organize and analyze student program information to assess progress in order to enhance student outcomes as a promising practice.

The committee determined that measures taken to assess the individual training needs of paraprofessionals in order to plan and implement comprehensive training is a promising practice. A needs assessment was completed by each paraprofessional. The director of special education researched methods and materials for training paraprofessionals and purchased materials she will utilize for the training. The materials are units and may be used independently as appropriate.

Maintenance

The steering committee concluded that the child find activities and referral procedures are effective in meeting the intent of requirements and the needs of the district.

The steering committee determined procedures are in place to ensure students voluntarily enrolled in private schools and placed in out of district settings are provided appropriate educational benefits.

The committee concluded personnel and professional development completed by the professional development committee, which includes special educators, ensure personnel are adequately prepared to provide for the educational needs of children with disabilities. This staff development has included training administrators on procedures regarding suspension and expulsion as outlined in the district's comprehensive plan.

Needs Improvement

Preschool screening, including the birth to 3 age group, was identified by the committee as an area needing improvement as the percentage of preschoolers attending screenings are less than 50% of those attending kindergarten within the district.

The committee concluded that the forms utilized within the district for TAT, referral and other aspects of special education need to be improved.

The steering committee identified the need to develop and maintain a comprehensive system of personnel development that is based upon an annual needs assessment completed by district educators as an area of needed improvement for the district. At this point in time, the Mobridge School District does not base the professional development training that is provided on any needs assessment completed by district staff.

Out of Compliance

An IEP in effect as of the December 1, 2001, child count was not found for four (4) students.

Validation Results

Promising Practices

The team validates the district's practice of advertising preschool screening on the local television station as a promising practice and encourages the use of this innovative technique for child find for all ages, birth-21.

The Mobridge District has gone beyond the requirements for training paraprofessionals through use of needs assessment, researching best practices and programs for training to empower paraprofessionals to be more confident and capable in meeting student needs. This is validated as a promising practice. The use of the Quality Schools Portfolio will allow all testing data to be organized and available to educators for planning, program evaluation, determination individual student needs, etc. This practice is innovative and will enhance positive student outcomes for all students thus are validated as a promising practice.

The team determined the district's procedure of involving parents in Teacher Assistance Teams as a promising practice. This is an innovative method that allows the parent to become involved in planning the program for the student at the pre-referral level when problems are initially noticed. The parents are then empowered as a "team" member and communication between them and key school personnel will be enhanced. Parents feel comfortable asking questions and providing input about their child. Together with the team of educators, parents are more involved in planning interventions, understand the need for referral and are on the team when the evaluations are planned.

Maintenance

The monitoring team agrees with all areas identified as maintenance for general supervision with the exception of personnel and professional development.

24:05:30:02.01 Parent participation in meetings.

The team did not validate procedures of paying parental expenses to attend IEPs, training, etc, for students placed out of district nor paying costs for the 20-year-old student as promising practices. As stated in the above regulations, these procedures meet the requirements and should be addressed as maintenance issues. If a student must be placed out of district in order to receive a free and appropriate public education, the parents of the student placed out of district must be afforded an opportunity to participate in all educational meetings concerning their child. The district is also responsible to provide a free and appropriate public education until the student becomes ineligible for services.

Areas that need improvement

The monitoring team agrees with all areas identified as needs improvement for general supervision as concluded by the steering committee with the addition of personnel and professional development.

Through staff interviews the team learned that there is no current plan of staff development for special or regular educators regarding special education techniques, procedures, disabilities, etc. Regular educators suggested they do not need training in special education, they depend upon the special educators to provide information. Inservice for special education happens "on an as needed basis, if you get a student with a problem you can't handle, you ask, they let you go". The district has identified the need for a comprehensive system of staff development and the team views this as an area needing improvement.

Areas out of compliance

24:05:17:03 Annual report of children served.

The district is required to maintain proper IEP documentation to support the student's eligibility for special education and for federal child count purposes. In a review of files, the review team was unable to find an IEP in effect as of the December 1, 2001 for 4 students. The district will be required to return

funds received for these misclassified students. A letter from the Office of Special Education will be generated requesting the amount of funds to be returned.

Principle 2 – Free Appropriate Public Education

All eligible children with disabilities are entitled to a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. The specific areas addressed in principle two are the provision of FAPE to children residing in group homes, foster homes, or institutions, making FAPE available when a child reaches his/her 3rd birthday and providing FAPE to eligible children with disabilities who have been suspended or expelled from school for more than 10 cumulative days.

Steering Committee Self-Assessment Summary

Data sources used:

- ? Instructional Staff Information
- ? Suspension and Expulsion Information
- ? Placement alternatives
- ? Personnel training records
- ? Budget information
- ? District records released to outside agencies
- ? Teacher schedules
- ? Numbers of preschoolers screened
- ? School age children referred placed, referred not placed

Promising Practice

Providing for the unique needs of a preschool child from a neighboring district through allowing the student to attend the district preschool is considered by the committee a promising practice. The resident district includes the child on the child count and pays only for occupational and physical therapy services. The Mobridge School District covers all additional costs for the child to be involved in their preschool program.

Maintenance

Collaboration between the Birth to 3 program results in appropriate transition of students into the Mobridge system at age 3.

The committee determined reimbursement of Wakpala Headstart for the costs of transporting children living in Mobridge and attending Wakapla's Headstart should be maintained as it ensures FAPE.

Communication from principals to parents of children on IEPs regarding behavior problems happens as often as principals communicate with parents of students without disabilities. Special educators inform parents of progress on behavior plans and include parents if plans are amended.

Areas that need improvement

The committee concluded there was a need for better documentation of staff and parental input in to program development including the development of student present levels of performance on the IEP.

Areas out of compliance

The committee concluded the district was out of compliance for suspension and expulsion of students needing special education or special education and related services as a student was expelled for more than 10 days with the IEP meeting not being held until the 19th day.

Validation Results

Promising Practice

The monitoring team validates the district procedure of providing FAPE for a preschool student from a neighboring school district. It demonstrates collaboration for the enhancement of student outcomes. Through cooperative efforts this child benefits from services not available in his home district. Collaborative efforts may benefit other students in the future and enhance services for both schools.

The team also concluded the development of a cooperative agreement with Headstart as an innovative solution for transportation needs within the district as well as classroom needs for Headstart. The district provides a classroom in the elementary school for Headstart, and Headstart provides transportation for students throughout the school day. Collaboration in this manner opens avenues for inclusive preschool programming, shared teaching and other innovative activities.

Maintenance

The monitoring team agrees with all areas identified by the steering committee as maintenance for free appropriate public education.

Areas that need improvement

The team validates the need for better documentation of parental input but concludes it will be more thoroughly addressed under the principles of evaluation and IEP.

Areas out of compliance

24:05:26:01 Suspension from school

24:05:26:01:01 Expulsion from school

The suspension and/or expulsion of eligible students who receive services according to an IEP must include the general due process procedures used for all students as well as additional steps in the process that a district must take if the student is receiving special education and related services under an individualized education program.

Although the district has written procedures in the comprehensive plan and administrators have been trained in the required process, the team determined procedures have not been implemented in the district. Through staff interviews the team found two students in need of special education or special education and related services had been suspended for more than 10 days without the IEP team being reconvened. The IEP meeting was held on the 19th day of suspension for one student. The second student was suspended several times for a cumulative total, which exceeded 20 days, with no evidence found that the IEP team came together for a meeting. Functional behavior assessments were neither completed nor positive behavior interventions developed for either student. The monitoring team has validated suspension and expulsion being an area of non-compliance for the Mobridge School District.

Principle 3 – Appropriate Evaluation

A comprehensive evaluation is conducted by a team of knowledgeable staff, which also includes parental input. A valid and reliable evaluation will result in effective individualized education programs for eligible students. The specific areas addressed in principle three are written notice and consent for evaluation, evaluation procedures and instruments, eligibility determination, reevaluation and continuing eligibility.

Steering Committee Self-Assessment Summary

Data sources used:

- ? Teacher file reviews
- ? Surveys
- ? District Comprehensive Plan for Special Education
- ? Parental rights document
- ? Consent and Prior notice forms
- ? Public Awareness Information
- ? FERPA disclosure
- ? Review of Access logs
- ? Personnel Training
- ? Budget information
- ? Disabling Conditions
- ? Exiting Information
- ? Placement by Disabling Conditions

Promising Practices

The steering committee determined the district has gone beyond minimal requirements by employing an individual, Dr. Susan Cassatt, Ph.D. Dr. Cassatt is certified as a school psychologist, and licensed as a clinical psychologist. She completes psychological evaluations and provides individual and family counseling.

Maintenance

The steering committee concluded that procedures are in place for processing new referrals. The special education director initiates parental contact, secures informed parental consent for evaluations, and arranges evaluation in all areas of the suspected disability with reliable instruments. Special educators are responsible to coordinate the reevaluation process, including securing informed parental consent and ensuring evaluation in all areas of suspected disability.

The steering committee found that all students suspected of having a disability are consistently evaluated to determine if they are eligible for services as outlined in state regulations. The committee further concluded that if district staff do not have the expertise to evaluate in specific areas of disability, other appropriate agencies are contacted to complete the evaluations.

Areas that need improvement

The steering committee determined the district must do a better job at documenting parental input into planning the evaluation process. Additionally, the district is aware of the requirement to do functional assessments but needs further training and practice with this requirement.

Areas out of compliance

The committee concluded the district was out of compliance for not documenting parental consent for evaluation for one transfer student, for no documentation that a parent had been afforded parental rights at the time of a prior notice, and for not completing evaluations within 25 days, nor extending the timeline for one high school student.

Validation Results

Promising Practices

The team validates as a promising practice the district's employment of Dr. Susan Cassatt, School and Clinical Psychologist. Through the employment of Dr. Cassatt, the district has ensured a level of evaluation, consultation and direct services to children. Such expertise will allow for the district to meet the unique needs of students with behavioral, emotional and mental disabilities within the school without referring to outside agencies. In addition, Dr. Cassatt can provide therapy to families. The potential for

innovative programming to design and implement interventions for troubled youth is wonderful. In addition, Dr. Cassatt may provide ongoing support and training for the educational staff to enhance their abilities to deal with challenging students.

Maintenance

The review team validates that the director of special education insures initial evaluations occur in a timely manner with evaluations conducted in all areas of suspected disability. Special educators are responsible for reevaluations in area of assignment. If expertise is not available at the local level, other agencies are contacted to conduct evaluations.

Areas that need improvement

The review team concluded evaluation procedures for students with specific learning disabilities as an area needing improvement. Through staff interviews and file reviews the team discovered special educators within the district lack a clear understanding of all the requirements, including, observation by someone other than the classroom teacher, documentation of the severe discrepancy and the required components of the multidisciplinary team report. In 4 of 7 files reviewed of students with learning disabilities one or more components were not found.

The review team concluded the district was in compliance in obtaining parental consent for evaluations. District staff also clearly documented that parents had been afforded parental rights at the time of an evaluation as well as prior notice. The district was also in compliance for completing evaluations within 25 days. Although reviewers found isolated instances in which these requirements were not documented in the file, findings were of minimal frequency and do not constitute a systemic problem. In recognizing the problem, the district has acknowledged the need to address it thus it remains an area needing improvement.

Areas out of compliance

24:05:25:04.02. Determination of needed evaluation data.

24:05:25:04. Evaluation procedures.

School districts shall ensure, at a minimum, that parents are provided opportunity for input into the evaluation process, that evaluation procedures include use of a variety of assessment tools and that strategies are used to gather relevant functional and development information about the child, including information provided by the parents, that may assist in determining whether the child has a disability and the educational needs of the child. Evaluations must be administered conformance with the instructions provided by their producer. The evaluation must be sufficiently comprehensive to identify all of the child's special education and related services needs.

The team concluded through staff interviews and file reviews that parental input is not consistently received nor documented within the Mobridge School District. In 13 of 21 files reviewed, there was not documentation that parents were given opportunity for input into planning the evaluation process.

Through staff interviews and file reviews the team concluded students are consistently not evaluated in all areas of the suspected need, nor are parents afforded an explanation of rights relative to this requirement. The interviews conducted at Freeman-Davis suggested that after the initial evaluation, reevaluation occurs with the prior notice reflecting a statement such as "It has been a year since we developed the IEP, we would like to do a diagnostic in order to determine needs and diagnostic information". The Woodcock Reading and Key Math are then administered if the student qualified in both reading and math. In 5 of 5 files reviewed, this practice was documented. Annual testing with the OWLS is also completed as a component of the Fast Forward and Step 4 word program. Annual testing is not a recommended procedure in the manual and invalidates the test for use in determining eligibility when the student's three-year reevaluation is required.

The review team determined requirements are not implemented to complete functional assessment to determine strengths and needs or how the disability impacts progress through the regular curriculum.

Special educators indicated they were aware of the requirement, but uncertain how to do functional assessments so they had not been completed. In 18 of 21 files reviewed, there was no documentation of functional assessments. Staff did not understand this information must be collected and used for determining specific skills areas affected by the student's disability, the student's present levels of performance, their progress in the general curriculum or development of measurable annual goals and short term instructional objectives.

Principle 4 – Procedural Safeguards

Parents of children with disabilities have certain rights available. The school makes parents aware of these rights and makes sure they are understood. The specific areas addressed in principle four are adult student/transfer of rights, content of rights, consent, written notice, confidentiality and access to records, independent educational evaluation (IEE), complaint procedures, and due process hearings.

Steering Committee Self-Assessment Summary

Data sources used:

- ? Teacher file reviews
- ? Surveys
- ? Comprehensive Plan
- ? Public awareness information
- ? FERPA disclosure
- ? Review of access logs
- ? Personnel training
- ? Budget information

Maintenance

The steering committee concludes the district makes all attempts possible to protect a young person's rights when parents are absent from meetings. The district publishes public notice each fall in the newspaper. Surrogate parents, whom have been provided appropriate information, are used when needed. The transfer of rights is addressed appropriately in IEPs when required. The district maintains policies and procedures, which address access to records, complaint procedures, due process hearings, student and parents rights under the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) and the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Information on how to obtain an independent educational evaluation appear in the parents rights booklet.

Areas that need improvement

The committee determined the district should maintain an actual list of surrogate parents due to the numbers of children in foster care. The committee concluded the district should make available to parents pursuing an independent educational evaluation a list of locations for evaluations, required qualifications for examiners, lists of examiners and the maximum allowable costs for the various evaluations.

Validation Results

Maintenance

With the exception of FERPA Notice, the monitoring team was able to validate all areas listed under maintenance for procedural safeguards.

Areas that need improvement

The monitoring team agrees with all areas identified as needs improvement for procedural safeguards as concluded by the steering committee.

Areas out of compliance

24:05:29:03. Annual notification of rights.

Each school district shall annually notify parents of students currently in attendance and eligible students currently in attendance at the agency or institution of their rights under the Act and this notice must contain specific content. The monitoring team reviewed the FERPA notice as provided in a handbook used by Freeman Davis and concluded that required contact was lacking. A copy of a model notification of rights under FERPA is available on the Family Policy and Compliance Office website, www.ed.gov/offices/OM/fpco under “Technical Assistance of LEA officials”.

Principle 5 – Individualized Education Program

The Individualized Education Program (IEP) is a written document for a child with a disability that is developed, reviewed and revised by the IEP team, which includes the parent. The specific areas addressed in principle five are IEP team, IEP content, transition components for secondary IEPs, annual reviews, transition from early intervention program, and IEP related issues.

Steering Committee Self-Assessment Summary

Data sources used:

- ? Teacher file reviews
- ? Student Progress Data
- ? Personnel Development information
- ? Budget information
- ? Disabling Conditions Information
- ? Previous monitoring report
- ? Early Intervention Part C Information

Promising Practices

The staff sometimes goes to the home of a parent for a meeting or signature if the parent can't or won't come to school.

A “Passport” form is used at the beginning of the school year to share information with the regular education staff who will be working with students in special education. This enhances communication in a time saving manner and then the teachers have a record of the student's strengths and needs on hand, which they can refer to as needed.

Maintenance

The steering committee concluded several attempts are made to get parents to attend meetings and insure appropriate team membership is present. Signatures document appropriate membership at IEP meetings. Goals and objectives are developed and revised or new ones added at the IEP meeting. Extended school year is addressed as outlined by regulations. The committee found if behavior impacts learning, a behavior plan is developed. Related services along with other special factors are addressed. The child's least restrictive environment is always addressed on the IEP.

Areas that need improvement

The committee concluded a need for a more friendly form for parental and teacher input. The committee also concluded that curriculum and creative instructional approaches could be improved at the elementary level, especially in terms of modifying instruction. The committee identified a need to develop a more effective way of measuring overall program effectiveness. The committee also noted that student present levels of performance need to consistently state parental input on every IEP.

Validation Results

Promising Practices

The monitoring team concludes the use of the “Passport” system is an innovative and effective way of communicating a student’s strengths, needs, instructional techniques and modifications to the classroom teachers without having to wait for meetings. The form lists approximate functioning levels in basic skill areas, physical limitations, preferred learning styles, related services, areas needing assistance, and instructional formats. Modifications are also listed with brief narratives describing what has and has not worked with a section for behavior management considerations. The “Passport” allows classroom teachers a quick, easy way to prepare to meet the unique needs of each student on an IEP.

Maintenance

The monitoring team agrees with all areas identified as maintenance for individual educational program as concluded by the steering committee with the following addition:

24:05:25:16. Parent participation.

Each district shall ensure that one or both parents of the child are present at each IEP team meeting or are afforded the opportunity to participate. If parents cannot attend, the district shall use other methods to ensure participation, including individual or conference telephone calls.

The monitoring team could not validate as a promising practice the district’s practice of going to the home to insure parental involvement in the IEP, as this is a measure which appears essential to gain the parental participation as mandated in the regulation.

Areas that need improvement

The monitoring team agrees with all areas identified as needs improvement for individual educational program as concluded by the steering committee.

Areas out of compliance

24:05:27:01.03. Content of individualized education program.

Each student’s individualized educational program shall include statement of how the student’s progress toward the annual goals will be measured and reported to parents at least as often as parents with nondisabled students are informed of their student’s progress. The progress reports must state the student’s progress toward the annual goals and the extent to which the progress is sufficient to enable the student to achieve the goals by the end of the year.

Through review of student file records and interviews the team found that progress reporting does not happen for the preschool population. In all preschool files reviewed there was no documentation of progress reports. The preschool special educator indicated she sees parents on a daily basis and gives them verbal reports regarding the progress of their children.

24:05:27:13.02. Transition services.

Transition services are a coordinated set of activities for a student, designed within an outcome-oriented process, which promotes movement from school to post-school activities. The coordinated set of activities shall be based on the individual student’s needs, taking into account the student’s preferences and interests, and shall include instruction, related services, community experiences, the development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives, and, if appropriate, the acquisition of daily living skills and functional vocational evaluation.

Through interviews with special education staff and file reviews the review team concluded transition services do not adequately address the required outcome oriented process based upon the unique needs of the individual. In 3 of 4 files reviewed of students 16 or older, appropriate assessments were either not completed or documented for the purpose of transition planning. In 3 of 6 files reviewed of transition age students, outcome statements for employment were not appropriately written to describe the long-term employment outcome. These statements described current skills, i.e., “completes chores at home; works to clean kennels,” or statements such as “unsure of type of employment...” Teachers interviewed suggested confusion over assessment for transition planning and how to write appropriate outcomes.

Principle 6 – Least Restrictive Environment

After the IEP is developed or reviewed, the IEP team must decide where the IEP services are to be provided. Consideration begins in the general education classroom for school age students. The specific areas addressed in principle six are placement decisions, consent for initial placement, least restrictive environment procedures, preschool children, and LRE related issues.

Steering Committee Self-Assessment Summary

Data sources used:

- ? Teacher file reviews
- ? Student Progress Data
- ? Personnel Development information
- ? Budget information
- ? Disabling Conditions Information
- ? Previous monitoring report
- ? Early Intervention Part C Information

Promising practices

The steering committee concluded that the measures taken to involve special educators in co-teaching with regular education teachers has enhanced efforts for inclusion.

Increasing the number of paraprofessionals from 2 to 7 indicates the district’s commitment to meeting the needs of the students in the least restrictive environment.

Maintenance

The steering committee concluded that through continually exposing the special education staff to inclusive practices and training, including children as “one group” within the educational system and through the special education department promoting LRE and inclusion of students with special needs requirements for LRE are being maintained.

Areas that need improvement

The steering committee concluded there continues to be a need for more training on inclusion and effective use of paraprofessionals in the classrooms.

Validation Results

Promising practices

The monitoring team concluded that the district’s willingness to more than double the numbers of paraprofessionals available indicates a strong commitment to insuring adequate staffing patterns to make inclusionary practices a reality. Not only has the district significantly increased the number of paraprofessionals available but also measures have been taken to train them to enhance their effectiveness.

Maintenance

24:05:28:01. Least restrictive program to be provided.

Children in need of special education or special education and related services shall be provided special programs and services to meet with individual needs which are coordinated with the regular educational program whenever appropriate. Removal from the regular educational classroom may occur only when the nature or severity of the child's needs is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

Through file reviews, interviews and observations the team determined the practice of co-teaching considered a maintenance activity rather than a promising practice. It allows students to remain in the least restrictive environment, which is the intent of the regulation.

Areas that need improvement

The monitoring team agrees with all areas identified as needs improvement for individual educational program as concluded by the steering committee.

Areas out of compliance

24:05:28:01. Least restrictive program to be provided.

Removal from the regular educational classroom may occur only when the nature or severity of the child's needs is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. The individual educational plan must include a justification statement, including potential harmful effects of the proposed placement, describing reasons the student can not be educated with nondisabled peers.

Through staff interviews, file reviews and observations the monitoring team concluded that regardless of the nature and severity of the disability, unique need or strengths of the student, all students are placed in the resource room for special education services at Freeman Davis elementary school. Least restrictive environment through a continuum of alternative placements is not a reality in this setting. A review of 5 files and interviews with both classroom teachers, the special educator, and the paraprofessional supported this conclusion. All students with special needs are pulled into the resource room for services. The time in the resource room is generally the same if the students qualify in reading, math and spelling: 1hr reading, 1 hr. phonics/spelling, math, 45 minutes. The justification statement on the IEPs for the "resource room" students is not student specific and addresses the need for direct instruction, individualized instruction, and to acquire the skills necessary to progress through school successfully rather than justification for not educating the students within the regular classroom.

The LRE sections of the IEP were the same for preschool age students and did not address the unique, individual needs of the students. Through review of middle school speech files with the speech clinician the team determined justification statements were written to describe the services and therapy rather than to justify why the students' could not be provided in the regular classroom.